

Serial No. 09/653,381

Page 6 of 10

**REMARKS**

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed July 16, 2007. In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that claims 1-23, 25 and 28 are pending and rejected.

In view of the following discussion, Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

It is to be understood that Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant response.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of Claims 1-11, 14, 16-23, 25 and 28**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10, 14, 16-17, 19-23, 25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludvig et al. (International Pub No WO 00/0589, hereinafter "Ludvig") in view of Dunn (U.S. Patent 5,861,906, hereinafter "Dunn"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 19 has been canceled, and its rejection is therefore moot.

Independent claims 1 and 20 have been amended to further clarify Applicants' invention. The amended claims recite, among others, "receiving one or more user-generated search criteria via user interaction with said search object, the one or more user-generated search criteria comprising one or more keywords composed by a user." Subject matter of the amended claims finds support on p.45, lines 4-6, of the original specification, which teaches that the viewer can enter any combination of one or more keywords. Thus, no new matter has been added.

Ludvig teaches, e.g., Abstract and page 4, line 8 - page 5, line 12, a method and apparatus for combining video frame sequences with a video display of an interactive program guide (IPG). Specifically, background information and video frame sequences are combined with different program guide graphics to form different video frame

590015-1

Serial No. 09/653,381  
Page 7 of 10

sequences, which are encoded and multiplexed for transmitting to a subscriber using a single transport stream. This allows a subscriber to transit from one program guide to the next without interruption of the background or video display as the program guide graphic is changed.

Although Ludvig discloses an IPG being received by a subscriber, there is no teaching or suggestion for searching the IPG, providing a search object comprising a video slice encoded by a service provider, or other features relating to a method of searching a program guide database, or an IPG page having a search window object to support a search, as provided in Applicants' claims 1 or 20.

Applicants submit that since Ludvig does not teach or suggest any aspect of searching an IPG, there is simply no motivation to combine Ludvig's method of encoding an IPG with Dunn's method for customizing operation based on viewer preferences, which provides certain search capabilities.

Furthermore, even if combined, Ludvig and Dunn would not have resulted in Applicants' invention because, as set forth below, Dunn also does not teach or suggest at least the feature of "the one or more user-generated search criteria comprising one or more keywords composed by a user," as provided in claims 1 and 20.

The cited portions of Dunn (Figs. 1, 5, 9, 12 and col. 2, lines 40-61, col. 3, lines 3-16, and col. 5, lines 21-58) disclose various aspects of a method for customizing programs in an interactive entertainment network system, e.g., for video-on-demand (VOD) applications. Specifically, the system provides various buttons that allow a viewer to select different criteria for grouping programs into manageable sets for more selective review (e.g., col. 6, lines 58-63).

In one example, Dunn teaches that when a viewer is browsing program trailers, a customized list of programs can be created by clicking a "add to list" button to add the program ID corresponding to the program whose trailer is being displayed (Fig. 3; col. 6, line 64 - col. 7, line 4). There is no teaching or suggestion that the customized list is created based on any search criteria such as keywords composed by the viewer.

In another example, when the VOD application is activated, a set-top box (STB) transmits a message containing the viewer ID to the headend. In response, the

590015-1

Serial No. 09/653,381  
Page 8 of 10

headend queries a program information database to retrieve all program IDs that are correlated with that viewer ID, and the relevant program data records, e.g., in the customized list, are transmitted back to the STB (col. 3, lines 9-16; Fig. 5, col. 7, line 56 - col. 8, line 23). The search criterion in this case is simply the viewer ID that is transmitted by the STB, and not based on any keywords generated by the viewer.

In other examples, different buttons allow the viewer to pull up different sets of programs according to other possible search criteria (Fig. 4; col. 7, lines 44-54; Fig. 9, col. 9, line 52 - col. 10, line 4), which may include different categories such as new releases, list of stars, titles and the customized viewer list.

However, these search criteria in Dunn are provided on the IPG for selection by the viewer, i.e., they are predetermined criteria provided by the system, and unlike Applicants' invention, they are not keywords generated or composed by the viewer.

Thus, the combined teaching of Ludvig and Dunn does not teach at least "the one or more user-generated search criteria comprising one or more keywords composed by a user," as provided in claims 1 and 20.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 20 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Ludvig and Dunn, alone or in combination.

Moreover, since all of the dependent claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 or 20, and recite additional limitations thereof, these dependent claims are also patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Ludvig and Dunn, alone or in combination.

Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

### **35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of Claims 12-13 and 15**

The Examiner has rejected claims 12-13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludvig in view of Dunn and further in view of Lemmons et al. (US Pat App Pub No 2003/0115603, hereinafter "Lemmons"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner stated that the combined teaching of Ludvig and Dunn does not teach the respective features recited in claims 12-13 and 15. Thus, the Examiner cited paragraphs 42 and 88 of Lemmons for teaching the corresponding features.

590015-1

Serial No. 09/653,381  
Page 9 of 10

However, there is no argument put forth in the Office Action that Lemmons provides those features that are missing from Ludvig and Dunn.

Furthermore, although Lemmons teaches a program search display mode using a restrictive search selection criterion, the available selection criteria are displayed and provided by the IPG, as defined by the headend telecasting center (see, for example, Lemmons paragraphs 27 and 74; Fig. 7). This is also different from Applicants' invention, in which the search criteria (e.g., keywords) are generated by the user, and not pre-defined by the headend.

Since claims 12-13 and 15 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1, these claims are also not obvious over the teaching of Ludvig, Dunn and Lemmons, either alone or in combination.

As such, Applicants submit that dependent claims 12-13 and 15 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Ludvig in view of Dunn and further in view of Lemmons, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

#### **THE SECONDARY REFERENCES**

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this Office Action.

590015-1

Serial No. 09/653,381  
Page 10 of 10

### CONCLUSION

Thus, Applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application, are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404, so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/15/07



Eamon J. Wall  
Registration No. 39,414  
Attorney for Applicants

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702  
Telephone: 732-530-9404  
Facsimile: 732-530-9808